

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

JEFFREY TAYLOR and ROBERT  
SELWAY, on behalf of themselves and  
all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

AMAZON.COM, INC., a Delaware  
corporation,

Defendant.

CASE NO. No. 2:24-cv-00169-MJP

ORDER CONTINUING STAY OF  
DISCOVERY

**INTRODUCTION**

This matter came before the Court on the Parties' Discovery Conference Report. (Dkt. No. 42.) After considering the arguments raised by the Parties therein, and all other supporting documents, the Court ORDERS that discovery remain stayed until the Court rules on Amazon's forthcoming motion to dismiss.

**BACKGROUND**

This case arises out of a consumer protection claim brought by Plaintiffs Jeffrey Taylor and Robert Selway (the “Plaintiffs”), who seek to represent a class of similarly situated members, against Amazon.com, Inc. The Court previously granted Amazon’s Motion to Dismiss and gave Plaintiffs thirty days to file an amended complaint. (Dkt. No. 33.) The Court then stayed discovery in this case and ordered the Parties to meet and confer regarding discovery after Plaintiffs’ amendment. (Dkt. No. 34.) Plaintiffs timely filed their First Amended Complaint (Dkt. No. 35), and the Court granted a stipulated briefing schedule related to Amazon’s forthcoming motion to dismiss. (Dkt. No. 39.) The Court also ordered the Parties to meet and confer regarding the stay of discovery and provide a report to the Court discussing “(1) whether the stay of discovery should be kept in place pending Amazon’s motion to dismiss; and (2) if the stay of discovery were to be lifted, whether the Court should consider any limits on discovery while the motion to dismiss is pending.” (Dkt. No. 39 at 4.) The Parties conferred and filed their joint Discovery Conference Report, which requests the Court revisit whether the stay should be maintained or not. (Dkt. No. 42.)

**ANALYSIS**

“[D]istrict courts have the inherent authority to manage their dockets and courtrooms with a view toward the efficient and expedient resolution of cases.” Dietz v. Bouldin, 579 U.S. 40, 47 (2016) (collecting cases). And district courts have “wide discretion in controlling discovery,” including by staying discovery. See Little v. City of Seattle, 863 F.2d 681, 685 (9th Cir. 1988).

The Court finds it reasonable to uphold the current stay of discovery until resolution of the upcoming motion to dismiss. The stay is currently in place and Plaintiffs fail to show how

1 they would be prejudiced by maintaining the status quo. Nor does the stay threaten to be  
2 “indefinite,” (see Dkt. No. 42 at 3,) because the motion is set to ripen on November 8, 2024. (See  
3 Dkt. No. 39.) The stay will remain in place until the Court’s decision on Amazon’s upcoming  
4 motion to dismiss.

5 **CONCLUSION**

6 The Court ORDERS that discovery remain stayed until the Court rules on Amazon’s  
7 forthcoming motion to dismiss.

8 The clerk is ordered to provide copies of this order to all counsel.

9 Dated September 10, 2024.

10 

11 Marsha J. Pechman  
12 United States Senior District Judge  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24